

## 4.5 Cultural Resources

Based on the negative results of a record search and intensive field survey, the Proposed Project is unlikely to result in any impacts to cultural resources. For purposes of NEPA, the National Indian Gaming Commission (NIGC) is serving as the lead federal agency and in consultation with the California State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), is responsible for determining whether the Proposed Project would result in any adverse effects to historic properties on and off the Reservation. As a result of SHPO consultation (Appendix D), the NIGC has determined that no historic properties would be affected by the Proposed Project. For purposes of the TEIR, the Tribe has similarly determined that the Proposed Project would result in any adverse effects to historic properties off the Reservation. Encroachment permits will be required from Caltrans and the County of San Diego. This will require CEQA compliance.

### Impact Analysis

#### ***4.5a - Would the proposed project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical or archeological resource?***

The cultural resource survey did not identify any cultural resource within the project APE. Due to the extensive disturbance and development and based on previous research within the APE it is highly unlikely that intact cultural resources are present in the APE. The SHPO has concurred with the NIGC's determination that no adverse effects to historic properties would occur from the proposed project (Appendix D). However, several potentially significant resources have been recorded in the vicinity of the APE.

Because of previous land uses in the APE any subsurface deposits would be difficult to identify using current techniques and any possible detection must await grading monitoring. It is therefore recommended a professional archaeologist monitor and a Native American monitor observe all-ground disturbing activity associated with construction of the project to ensure that no unidentified subsurface archaeological deposits are impacted (**Impact CR-1**).

#### ***4.5b - Would the proposed project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?***

Paleontological resources are found in sedimentary rock formations, not the granitic alluvial soils found in the project area. There are no paleontological resources in the project area. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in an adverse impact to a paleontological resource. There is no potential for a significant impact to paleontological resources.

#### ***4.5c - Would the proposed project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?***

The Proposed Project would be constructed almost entirely on the Reservation within the footprint of the existing casino and adjacent citrus groves. Therefore, the Proposed Project

would not disturb any human remains. There is little potential for a significant impact to human remains.

### **Mitigation Measures**

**CR 1** - Should any evidence of archaeological materials be discovered during site excavation, all work on that excavation site is to be stopped immediately, and the Tribe's cultural resources staff shall be called at once to investigate the area. All work at such site is to remain stopped until authorization to proceed is granted by the Tribal Chairperson. Recommendations regarding any cultural resource mitigation associated with the Proposed Project will be made to the Tribe by a qualified archaeological consultant. This mitigation measure remains in effect for potential on- and off-Reservation impacts.

### **Expanded Casino Alternative**

Under the Expanded Casino Alternative, no impacts would be expected to occur to cultural resources since no cultural resources have been identified for the larger Proposed Project site. However, due to the possibility of buried cultural resources, Mitigation Measure CR-1 described for the Proposed Project would be implemented during construction for the Expanded Casino Alternative.

### **No Action Alternative**

The potential for impacts to subsurface cultural resources impacts described for the Proposed Project would not occur under the No Action Alternative.

## **4.6 Geology and Soils**

### **Impact Analysis**

**4.6a - *Would the proposed project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:***

***i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 41.***

There are no known earthquake faults delineated on the Pauma Reservation on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist. The closest known fault is the Elsinore Fault, which runs in a northwest/southeast direction from Temecula through Julian and comes within approximately 2,000 feet northeast of the Project Site at the base of Palomar Mountain. The Elsinore Fault Zone crosses the San Luis Rey River at Lake Henshaw. The last major eruption was a magnitude 6.0 event in May 15, 1910. Major seismic events associated with this fault are predicted to occur once every 250 years. Because all of

Southern California is subject to strong seismic activity, all buildings would be constructed to meet or exceed CBC standards. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not expose people or structures to the adverse effects of fault rupture. This potential impact would be less than significant.

***ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?***

As is noted above, the Project Site is located within Southern California, which is subject to periodic strong seismic ground shaking. Because the Project Site is not located on or immediately adjacent to any known faults and because the buildings would meet the CBC for Southern California, strong seismic ground shaking would not result in a substantial risk to persons. This impact would be less than significant.

***iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?***

The Project Site is located on alluvial soils with the potential for liquefaction. However, liquefaction also requires that there be groundwater near the surface, such as along a river or near the beach. Liquefaction danger is considered to be relatively low for areas with a groundwater table of 50 feet or more. The depth to groundwater beneath the Project Site is over 100 feet. Therefore, the potential for liquefaction is considered to be very low. To prevent seismic-related failure, all building foundations would be appropriately designed for the geologic conditions on the Project Site. A geotechnical study conducted by PSI has recommended several foundations types that would support the proposed buildings and resist potential settling and ground motion, including liquefaction. This potential impact would not be significant by virtue of project design.

***iv) Landslides?***

The Project Site is relatively level and is not susceptible to landslides. Because the Project Site is not susceptible to landslides, persons or structures could not be exposed to the hazards of landslides. Therefore, this potential impact would not be significant.

***4.6b - Would the proposed project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?***

The Proposed Project would be constructed within the footprint of the existing casino and adjacent citrus groves. Although the slopes on the Project Site are gentle, the soils on the Project Site are susceptible to erosion. Therefore, the Proposed Project would include the implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) to limit erosion and the loss of topsoil. This potential impact would not be significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation measures are necessary for geology/soils.

### **Expanded Casino Alternative**

Under the Expanded Casino Alternative, geology and soils impacts would be the same as or less than those described for the Proposed Project. These impacts would not be significant and no mitigation would be required.

### **No Action Alternative**

The geology and soils impacts described for the Proposed Project would not occur under the No Action Alternative.

## **4.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

### **Impact Analysis**

#### ***4.7a - Would the proposed project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?***

The Proposed Project would not require the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Project construction would require standard construction materials and equipment, which would include materials classified as hazardous. These materials, such as petroleum products for construction vehicles and equipment, would be transported, stored, and used in accordance with applicable regulations. Upon completion, hazardous materials would be limited to cleaning and maintenance supplies, all of which are common to household and hotel uses and are currently being used at the existing hotel and casino. No significant impacts would result.

#### ***4.7b - Would the proposed project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?***

The Proposed Project would not require the storage or use of large quantities of hazardous materials. Standard construction and janitorial supplies that qualify as hazardous materials would be used, stored, and disposed of per manufacturers recommendations and applicable regulations. There is little risk that hazardous materials would be released from the Project Site, and in the event that there was a release of hazardous materials it would be contained on site. Therefore, there would not be a reasonably foreseeable upset or accident involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. This impact would not be significant.

#### ***4.7c - Would the proposed project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?***

The Proposed Project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school and would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials or substances. Therefore, this potential impact would not be significant.

***4.7d - Would the proposed project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?***

All proposed buildings would be constructed of concrete and steel, would feature irrigated landscaping and a buffer zone between the building and the native vegetation, and would have a fire alarm and sprinkler system. The Tribe is expanding its Fire Department and has developed Fire Service Agreements with the Pala, Rincon, San Pasqual, and Cal Fire Rincon CDF Fire Departments. These factors, combined with surrounding development and citrus groves, local fire stations equipped to fight wildland fires, 24-hour/day operations and surveillance, a large paved parking area surrounding all structures, and an evacuation plan, would make it very unlikely that a wildland fire would cause a significant loss, injury or death.

**Mitigation Measures**

The Proposed Project is not anticipated to result in significant hazards or hazardous materials impacts. However, the following design features would minimize the risks associated with hazardous materials and wastes:

**Standard Measure HM-1:** During construction, hazardous materials would be transported and stored in appropriate and approved containers. Required clearances would be maintained and materials would be handled in accordance with federal law and UIC's Hazardous Materials Control Plan and Safety Plan. The Tribe would ensure through the enforcement of contractual obligations that all contractors immediately control the source of any leak and immediately contain any spill of hazardous materials or waste using appropriate spill containment and countermeasures. Clean-up and disposal, if any is required, would also be handled in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations by licensed hazardous materials handlers and haulers for disposal at approved disposal sites.

**Expanded Casino Alternative**

Under the Expanded Casino Alternative, impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials would be the same as or less than those described for the Proposed Project. Mitigation Measure HM-1 described for the Proposed Project would be required for the Expanded Casino Alternative to ensure that any risks associated with hazardous materials and wastes are minimized.

**No Action Alternative**

The hazards and hazardous materials impacts described for the Proposed Project would not occur under the No Action Alternative.

## 4.8 Hydrology/Water Resources

The Proposed Project would rely entirely on the Tribe's on-Reservation water resources. All wastewater from the Proposed Project would be treated on the Reservation to California Title 22 standards and would be reused on the Reservation for the irrigation of citrus and avocado groves and landscaping. A portion of the recycled water will be reused for irrigation of landscape and replanted groves within the project area and the remainder will be recharged to groundwater via leach fields and percolation ponds. Water and wastewater services are discussed in more detail in Section 4.17, Utilities and Service Systems.

### Impact Analysis

#### ***4.8a - Would the proposed project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?***

The Proposed Project includes the expansion of the existing package wastewater treatment plant constructed for the existing casino. Although not required to do so, the Tribe has determined that the expanded wastewater treatment plant will meet California Title 22 Standards for recycled water. The recycled wastewater will be used to irrigate the project landscaping and replanted groves within the project area. No off-Reservation discharge of wastewater is proposed. This potential impact would not be significant.

#### ***4.8b - Would the proposed project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there should be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?***

A Water Balance Evaluation has been prepared for the Proposed Project (ENSI and BWC, 2008) and is attached to this EA/TEIR as Appendix H. The water balance is a comprehensive tracking of water demands, depletions, and groundwater recharge. The projected water increase in groundwater demands is 234 acre-feet per year. The projected increase in groundwater recharge is 144acre-feet per year, making the net increase in groundwater withdrawal for the Proposed Project 90 acre-feet per year. Based on this water balance, an interference analysis was performed for a nearby "subject well" to assess potential Off-Reservation lowering of groundwater levels. Potential impacts to area wells will diminish with distance, therefore the nearest known permitted well was chosen in order to perform a worst case analysis. As shown in the Water Supply Evaluation, the subject well is located on a parcel on the corner of Highway 76 and Hampton Road. The results show that over five years, impacts to area wells will be negligible. However over ten years, twice the County's guidelines for analysis, there will be an anticipated decrease of 0.4% to water levels in the subject well. Based on San Diego County Department of Planning and Land Use (DPLU) guidelines and area hydrogeology, this is not considered to be significant and likely is within the range of natural or background water level variability expected to occur seasonally. Therefore no significant drop in production rate or water levels in area wells is anticipated.

***4.8c - Would the proposed project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream, or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding off site?***

Pauma Creek is the closest drainage to the Project Site. There would not be any development within the Pauma Creek floodplain. There are two existing detention basins that collect runoff from the existing casino parking lot. The Proposed Project includes the construction of a third detention basin to handle the increased development area. The proposed third detention basin would be constructed within a disturbed upland area. There are two main storm drain systems proposed for the project (PDC 2008a): one is the on-site system which will collect all of the parking lot, building, and street runoff, and the second will collect the off-site runoff and direct it away from the casino to reduce the flow that enters the proposed on-site detention basin. Redirecting the off-site runoff will preserve the existing drainage pattern because the flow will still enter the existing detention basin prior to entering Pauma Creek. There would not be a substantial increase in flows to Pauma Creek as water would only overflow the detention basins during major storm events, which is the current condition. The purpose of the detention basins is to collect runoff on site and allow it to percolate into the groundwater table. The peak flow out of the proposed on-site detention basin will be less than the existing condition peak flow rate, and this basin will contain sufficient volume to mitigate increases in flows between existing and proposed flows (PDC 2008a). Therefore, this potential impact would be less than significant.

***4.8d - Would the proposed project create or contribute runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?***

The Proposed Project would increase the area of impermeable development over the existing casino structures and parking lot. Therefore, the Proposed Project includes modified drainage culverts and construction of a third detention basin to handle the projected increase in runoff. Most storm water would be collected in three detention basins where it would percolate into the porous ground to recharge the groundwater. Excess would be discharged to Pauma Creek in compliance with a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). This would minimize any potential contamination of Pauma Creek. Pollutants including sediments, heavy metals, organic compounds, trash and debris, oxygen demanding substances, oil and grease, bacteria and viruses, and pesticides would be generated by the Proposed Project. BMPs would be implemented to capture and manage these pollutants (PDC 2008b). Detailed site plans shall incorporate several BMPs to capture sand, oil, and other debris flowing off parking lots and roofs before leaving the Project Site, including the installation of a third sediment retention basin adjacent to the two existing basins in the southeast corner of the Project Site.

To ensure that the project would not result in adverse effects on water quality due to storm water runoff, and pursuant to the provisions of the Clean Water Act, a Notice of Intent (NOI) for Construction Activities would be submitted to the EPA at least two days prior to the commencement of construction. The NOI shall include a SWPPP. The objectives of the SWPPP would be to identify sources of sediment and other pollutants from the construction site that

could affect the quality of storm water discharges and to describe the practices to reduce sediment and other pollutants in storm water discharges generated from the construction site. The initial element of the SWPPP would be a training program to ensure that the construction personnel are thoroughly aware of the overall storm water pollution management program. The recommended control measures would then be constructed and installed as required depending on the phasing of construction. The specific erosion and sediment control practices or BMPs would address soil stabilization, erosion control measures, and practices to control sediment in storm water, sediment on adjoining roadways, and wind erosion. Implementation of these specific practices in conjunction with the SWPPP would protect the quality of surface waters in the project vicinity and significant adverse impacts to water quality would not result from the project.

***4.8e - Would the proposed project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structure, which would impede or redirect flood flows?***

The closest drainage to the Project Site is Pauma Creek. The extent of the 100-year flood hazard area for intermittent Pauma Creek has not been mapped on the Reservation but is being evaluated as part of the Proposed Project. All structures and parking areas would be placed outside of the identified 100-year flood hazard area. Therefore, this potential impact would not be significant.

***4.8f - Would the proposed project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?***

There are no levees or dams on or near the Project Site. Pauma Creek flows from north to south along the eastern edge of the Reservation. More often than not, there is no surface flow from the Reservation. The Proposed Project would not have any effect on Pauma Creek due to the intermittent nature of the creek and the lack of dams or levees. Therefore, the Proposed Project could not expose persons or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death as a result of flooding, including that caused by the failure of a dam or levee.

## **Mitigation Measures**

No adverse impacts to hydrology/water quality have been identified. No mitigation measures are necessary.

## **Expanded Casino Alternative**

Under the Expanded Casino Alternative, water demands for the larger facility would be higher than the current level but less than that described for the Proposed Project due to a decrease in patron visitation and employees resulting from the reduced scope of the Expanded Casino Alternative. The additional treated wastewater would also be higher under that Expanded Casino Alternative and less than that described for the Proposed Project and, like the Proposed Project, would be used for the irrigation of landscaping and groves and recharged to groundwater. All



hydrology/water resources impacts under the Expanded Casino Alternative would be either the same as or less than those for the Proposed Project, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

### **No Action Alternative**

The hydrology/water resources impacts described for the Proposed Project would not occur under the No Action Alternative.

## **4.9 Land Use**

### **Impact Analysis**

#### ***4.9a - Would the proposed project conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?***

With the exception of improvements to Pauma Reservation Road and the Pauma Reservation Road/SR-76 intersection, the Proposed Project is to be constructed entirely on the Pauma Reservation. No off-Reservation development is proposed and none would result from the Proposed Project. The Tribe has been operating a casino at this location since 2001. Therefore, the Proposed Project would expand upon an existing on-Reservation land use. This would not have a substantial or adverse effect on off-Reservation land uses.

#### ***4.9b - Would the proposed project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan covering lands?***

The County of San Diego has prepared a Multiple Species Conservation Plan (MSCP) in conformance with the State's Natural Communities Conservation Program (NCCP). The unincorporated lands surrounding the Pauma Reservation are within the North County Subarea. The North County MSCP subarea plan study area encompasses about 313,777 acres roughly encompassing the areas north of the San Dieguito River, Elfin Forest and Harmony Grove, north of Camp Pendleton, DeLuz, Fallbrook, Rainbow, Pauma Valley, Lilac, Valley Center, Rancho Guejito and the majority of Ramona. The subarea plan intends to cover 58 species many of which were covered in the existing MSCP Plan but also some additional species -- the most notable being the Stephen's kangaroo rat which lives in grasslands and the San Diego fairy shrimp which inhabits vernal pools. The County produced a preliminary administrative draft of the plan for agency and stakeholder review in November 2006. Because the East County Subarea Plan has not yet been completed and because the Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts to biological resources, the Proposed Project would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans. This impact would not be significant.

### **Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation is necessary for land use.

### **Expanded Casino Alternative**

Under the Expanded Casino Alternative, the existing on-Reservation land use represented by the operation of a casino would expand, but not to the extent described for the Proposed Project. There would not be an adverse land use effect under the Expanded Casino Alternative, either on or off the Reservation, and no mitigation is necessary for land use.

### **No Action Alternative**

The land use impacts described for the Proposed Project would not occur under the No Action Alternative.

## **4.10 Mineral Resources**

The Reservation contains vast quantities of alluvial deposits consisting of decomposed granite, sand, and aggregate materials. No other mineral resources are known on the Reservation. The most substantial mineral resources are the alluvial sand and gravel deposits found off-Reservation within the San Luis Rey River. The environmental sensitivity of the river has substantially reduced the ability for mining activities within the Pauma Valley and elsewhere along the river.

### **Impact Analysis**

#### ***4.10a - Would the proposed project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource classified MRZ-2 by the State Geologist that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?***

Sand and gravel are in high demand in Western San Diego County and supplies are limited. The Reservation contains small amounts of these materials, but has not excavated materials for export due to the small size of the Reservation and incompatibility with the residential and agricultural land uses. The Proposed Project would be constructed within the footprint of the existing casino and adjacent citrus groves, an area of the Reservation identified by the Tribe for commercial development. There are not any mineral resources classified MRZ-2 by the State Geologist in the project area. The majority of the proposed construction would occur on the Reservation. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in the loss of a mineral resource that would be of value to the region or residents of the state. This potential impact would not be significant.

#### ***4.10b - Would the proposed project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?***

The Proposed Project would be located entirely on the Reservation, where local general plans, specific plans, or other land use plans are inapplicable. Therefore, the Proposed Project does not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site as defined. This potential impact would not be significant.

## **Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation measures are necessary for mineral resources.

### **Expanded Casino Alternative**

Under the Expanded Alternative, like that for the Proposed Project, there would be no loss of availability of a mineral resource of value to the region or residents of the state, and no loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource. No mitigation is necessary for mineral resources.

### **No Action Alternative**

No impacts to mineral resources would occur under the No Action Alternative.

## **4.11 Noise**

### **Significance Thresholds**

#### ***Applicable Standards, Plans, Policies, and Regulations***

The County of San Diego defines a significant impact if a project would expose noise sensitive land uses to noise levels that would exceed 60 dBA CNEL or increase noise by 10 dBA above existing noise levels (County of San Diego 2007b).

The County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, Section 36.404 sets limits on the noise generated from one property to another. The limits apply to the average noise level over one hour,  $L_{eq}$ , and vary with the zoning of the properties concerned. Section 36.404 states, “Unless a variance has been applied for and granted pursuant to this chapter, it shall be unlawful for any person to cause or allow the creation of any noise to the extent that the one-hour average sound level, at any point on or beyond the boundaries of the property on which the sound is produced, exceeds the applicable limits . . . except that construction noise level limits shall be governed by Section 36.410 of this chapter.” The applicable limits for low density residential zones are 50 dBA Leq between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. and 45 dBA Leq between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. These limits shall be adopted for the purposes of this EA/TEIR.

The County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, Section 36.410, prohibits construction between the hours of 7:00 PM and 7:00 AM, and on Sundays and holidays. The County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, as interpreted by County staff, prohibits construction noise levels at residential properties exceeding 75 dBA when averaged over one hour (County of San Diego 2007b).

The Proposed Project would result in significant noise impacts if it would expose sensitive receptors to:

- A. Noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies;
- B. Generation of excessive groundbourne noise levels;
- C. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project; or
- D. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.

### **Impact Analysis**

***Would the proposed project result in noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?***

#### ***Construction***

Construction of the Proposed Project may occur 24 hours a day, seven days a week. However, clearing, grubbing, grading, trucking, and use of heavy equipment would be limited to the hours allowed by the County noise ordinance, that is, 7:00 AM to 7:00 PM, Monday through Saturday. Night and weekend work would be typically limited to interior work.

***On-site Activities.*** Construction equipment noise levels vary widely as a function of the equipment used and the activity level, or duty cycle. In a typical construction project, the loudest short-term noise levels – for a few minutes during each cycle – are those of earth-moving equipment under full load, which are on the order of 90 dBA at a distance of 50 feet from the source. Construction equipment noise is usually considered a point source, with attenuation within short distances at a rate of 6 dBA per doubling of distance, that is, a noise level of 90 dBA at 50 feet would be 84 dBA at 100 feet, 78 dBA at 200 feet, 60 dBA at 800 feet, 54 dBA at 1,600 feet, etc. The nature of construction projects, with equipment moving from one point to another, work breaks, and idle time, is such that long-term noise averages are less than short-term noise levels. For projects similar to the Proposed Project, a maximum 1-hour average noise level of 80 to 85 dBA  $L_{eq}$  at a distance of 50 feet from the construction area may be assumed for the site preparation phase.

The nearest off-Reservation homes to the casino site are would be approximately 1,150 feet from the northernmost extent of the construction area, which would be the access road and parking area. The distance from the major construction area of the casino, parking garage, and hotel, would be 1,400 feet or more. Minimum daytime noise levels in this rural area are estimated at approximately 40 dBA. At a distance of 1,150 feet, the maximum noise levels from construction to the nearest residences, if there was an unobstructed line of sight, would be 56 to 63 dBA,

depending on the composition of the intervening terrain. The hourly average noise levels would be 46 to 58 dBA Leq(h). At 1,400 feet, the noise levels would be approximately 2 dBA less than from 1,150 feet. The construction noise is likely to be audible at these nearest residences, but would not be anticipated to interfere with routine daytime activities. The construction noise levels would not exceed the 75 dBA Leq(h) threshold of the County noise impact guidance document (County of San Diego 2007b).

**Off-Site Trucking.** Noise would be generated off site by construction vehicle traffic, including the delivery of equipment and materials, the removal of demolition spoils, and the commuting of the crew. It is assumed that most truck traffic would travel to and from the site using SR-76 to the west. Existing peak hour traffic noise levels in the segment of SR-76 west of Pauma Reservation Road are calculated at approximately 69 dBA Leq(h) at receptors 50 feet from the road. Off peak traffic volumes could be half of peak hour volumes, resulting in noise levels of approximately 66 dBA Leq(h). Concentrated trucking, if it occurs, would be expected for certain construction activities, such as the removal of demolition spoils, the importing of required fill, and the supply of concrete for continuous pours. If construction traffic added 10 round trips, or 20 heavy truck passes in one hour, the average hourly noise level would increase by approximately 2 dBA in the quieter hours. The increased frequency of truck passes may be noticed by some residents. As stated in Section 3.11, it is widely accepted that the average healthy ear can barely perceive changes of 3 dBA. Therefore, the overall increase in hourly noise level would not be perceptible, and would be less than significant.

#### ***Operations - Off-site Traffic***

Upon completion of the Proposed Project, noise would be generated off site by the vehicle traffic of the patrons, employees, and vendors. As described in Section 4.16, for the year 2009 the forecast average daily traffic volume (ADT) between Pauma Reservation Road and Adams Drive would be 12,240 vehicles, and the volume between Pala Mission Road and Couser Canyon Road would be 14,970 ADT. The Proposed Project would generate in the order of 4,848 ADT, with 92 percent of the traffic coming from and going to the west. The average daily traffic volumes on SR-76 west of the site would increase by 30 to 36 percent. If the project-related traffic would be distributed proportionally to the existing traffic, the corresponding increase in CNEL would be 1.1 to 1.4 dBA. There is a potential for project-related traffic to be weighted towards the 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 a.m. hours because of evening and nighttime casino patronage. However, traffic on SR-76 is currently influenced by operations at a number of casinos in the area. Project impacts would not likely increase the CNEL more than 1.5 dBA. The increase would be less than the County of San Diego 10 dBA threshold for a significant impact. The impact would be less than significant.

The noise level increase described above is likely overestimated due to three factors. As noted in the project traffic report, a casino traffic generation factor was used that is substantially higher than the generation rate for the existing casino. Second, the increased traffic volume is likely to result in reduced average traffic speeds. Third, as most of the new casino and hotel traffic would be cars and light trucks, the percentage of heavy trucks in the mix would decrease. Neither a speed reduction nor a change in mix was used in the estimate of traffic noise increase.

***Would the proposed project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?***

### ***Construction***

As described above, construction activities would temporarily increase noise levels in the area of the Proposed Project and on SR-76 where trucking would occur. The changes in ambient noise levels would be heard by off-Reservation residents, but the increases would not be substantial. Because some construction is planned on the site for nights and weekends, Mitigation Measure N-1 has been included to prohibit project use of heavy trucks and equipment during late night and weekend hours, unless permitted or negotiated otherwise.

### ***Operations***

The project would include the addition of one or more diesel generators for the provision of emergency power. These generators would be test operated at least monthly, and perhaps as often as once per week. The noise level at off-site receptors from generator operations would be near daytime ambient levels, but could be considered a substantial temporary increase under certain nighttime meteorological conditions. Details of the generator design, location, and shielding are not known at this time. Therefore, Mitigation Measures N-2 and N-3 will be included in the project to avoid a potential significant impact. Mitigation Measure N-2 sets noise performance standards for the generator, and Mitigation Measure N-3 limits test operations to daytime hours.

The project would include the expansion and upgrading of the wastewater treatment plant. Final details of the plant design, equipment, and surrounding structures are not known at this time. Therefore, Mitigation Measure N-4 sets noise performance standards for the wastewater treatment plant and will be included to avoid a potential significant impact.

***Would the proposed project result in excessive groundbourne noise levels?***

Groundbourne noise levels and vibration are of concern when heavy construction, blasting or pile-driving occurs near to sensitive receptors. Off-Reservation receptors are at a distance from the Project Site where there would be no impact.

***Would the proposed project result in substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?***

### ***On-site Operations***

Noise would be generated on site by vehicles coming and leaving; air conditioning, heating, and kitchen equipment; trash collection; landscape maintenance equipment; and other activities typical of a commercial operation. The Proposed Project would include a large diesel backup generator that would provide power during interruptions of SDG&E service. The backup

generator would be run on a monthly basis to maintain operational readiness. The nearest off-Reservation receptors are approximately 1,150 feet from the site. At this distance there would be 25 to 30 dBA of noise reduction and there would be no substantial permanent increase in noise level and no significant noise impact.

### ***Off-site Traffic***

As described above, the project traffic would result in a 1.0 to 1.3 dBA increase in CNEL on the segments of SR-76 west of the casino site. This increase would not be substantial.

### **Mitigation Measures**

The Tribe shall implement the following mitigation measures in order to reduce or avoid potential adverse noise impacts:

**Mitigation Measure N-1:** Heavy truck traffic and use of heavy equipment shall be limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday, unless permitted or negotiated otherwise.

**Mitigation Measure N-2:** The emergency generator shall be designed and operated such that the noise generated at the casino property lines will not exceed 50 dBA Leq between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m., or 45 dBA Leq between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., consistent with the requirements of the County Noise Ordinance.

**Mitigation Measure N-3:** Project operations procedures shall require that testing of diesel generators occur between 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM.

**Mitigation Measure N-4:** The wastewater treatment plant shall be designed and operated such that the noise generated at the casino property lines will not exceed 50 dBA Leq between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m., 45 dBA Leq between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., consistent with the requirements of the County Noise Ordinance.

### **Expanded Casino Alternative**

Under the Expanded Casino Alternative, noise impacts would occur from construction of the larger facility and associated parking lot. These construction related impacts would be similar to those described for the Proposed Project although generally reduced and over a shorter duration of time due to being a much smaller facility. Increased operations associated with traffic would occur under the Expanded Casino Alternative in comparison with that for the existing casino, but less than that for the Proposed Project due to a decrease in patron visitation and employees. Noise associated with generators and operation of the wastewater treatment plant would be less than that described for the Proposed Project. Mitigation measures N-1 through N-4 as identified under the Proposed Project would be implemented under the Expanded Casino Alternative to ensure that both construction and operations noise impacts are below levels of significance.

## **No Action Alternative**

The noise impacts described for the Proposed Project would not occur under the No Action Alternative.

## **4.12 Population and Housing**

### **Impact Analysis**

#### **4.12a - *Would the proposed project induce substantial population growth?***

Rea & Parker Research has prepared a report on the effects of the Proposed Project on population in the area of inland North San Diego County (2007; Appendix I). Because of the relatively low multiplier effect for the area and the substitution effects of casino resorts, the projected new employment estimated to be generated in the area is 2,260 jobs (1,700 direct and 560 indirect). Based upon the existing residential distribution of Pauma employees, approximately 1,153 of those new jobs are likely to be taken by individuals who already reside within the area of inland North San Diego County, and the remaining positions are likely to be filled by individuals from a variety of locations, too dispersed to be relevant for any impact assessment. Official unemployment figures for the area, adjusted for “frictional unemployment,” show that there are at least 3,600 unemployed individuals already resident in the area, who are available to fill these jobs. Given inaccuracies and shortcomings in government-reported unemployment figures, there are likely an additional 8,600 “underemployed” individuals residing in the area to fill these jobs. Even if all the approximately 2,260 new direct and indirect jobs generated by the Proposed Project were to be filled by residents of inland North San Diego County, the population of approximately 12,200 unemployed and underemployed individuals already resident in the area would be a very adequate pool to meet this new employment demand. Thus, the population of the surrounding area is not anticipated to substantially increase as a result of the Proposed Project.

#### **4.12b - *Would the proposed project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?***

There are likely in the order of 12,200 unemployed or underemployed individuals already residing in the existing housing stock within inland North San Diego County (Rea & Parker Research, 2007). This constitutes a large pool of available workers, already resident in the area, which is more than adequate to cover the employment growth from the Proposed Project. Even if all the new direct and indirect jobs generated by the Proposed Project were to be filled by inland North San Diego County residents, the existing population of approximately 12,200 unemployed and underemployed individuals already residing in the area would be more than adequate to fill those positions. Thus the Proposed Project would not require the construction of new housing in the area. There are no residential structures on or adjacent to the Project site that would be affected by operation of the Proposed Project. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not displace any existing housing and this potential impact would not be significant.



### **Schools?**

As discussed above and in the Rea & Parker Research 2007 report, the unemployed and underemployed population already resident in the area is more than adequate and likely to fill the new direct and indirect jobs generated by the Proposed Project and the nearby expansions at the Pala Casino and Spa. These residents already have children in the existing area schools. Thus, the Proposed Project, together with any cumulative effect from the Pala Casino and Spa expansion will have no significant effect upon the area's schools. The Proposed Project would not increase the demand for off-Reservation schooling.

### **Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation measures are required for population and housing.

### **Expanded Casino Alternative**

Under the Expanded Casino Alternative, like the Proposed Project, population growth would not be induced, no existing housing would be displaced, and the demand for schooling would not increase. No mitigation is required for population and housing.

### **No Action Alternative**

No population and housing impacts would occur under the No Action Alternative.

## **4.13 Public Services**

### **Impact Analysis**

***4.13a - Would the proposed project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:***

#### ***Fire Protection?***

A Fire Analysis conducted for the Proposed Project included an evaluation of the increased occupant load that will occur on the project site. Occupant loads do not represent the actual number of people in a facility, but rather reflect the maximum number of occupants allowed for an entire facility as well as for specific areas of the facility. Taking into account the Proposed Project's gaming area, back of house area, hotel/villas, resort facilities, meeting facility, and events area, the total new occupant load will be 15,727 people (Andy Wells, 2008; Appendix J). This occupant load will result in an increased fire and emergency medical call volume of less than one per day. Based on occupant load and call volumes at other casino and hotel facilities in the area, an average of less than one call per day can be expected under operation of the

Proposed Project (Andy Wells, 2008; Appendix J). Fire service statistics show that 80% or more of these calls will be for non-fire emergencies.

Because the most important fire protection measure is prevention, followed by containment and rapid suppression, the proposed buildings will be primarily constructed of concrete and steel. In accordance with the Tribal/State Gaming Compact, all construction must conform with the California Building Code, which includes building and fire safety provisions. High rise buildings regulated by the California State Building Code have built-in fire protection features that add protection to the structure and occupants. These features will be incorporated into construction and operation of the Proposed Project, and include:

- Automatic fire sprinkler systems throughout
- Standpipe systems in each stairwell for firefighting purposes
- Automatic fire pump with backup water supply on site
- Fully automatic fire alarm system
- Smoke control systems
- Protected stair enclosures

An adequate water supply will be available on the Reservation for fire suppression. Given the application of a 50% reduction in fire flow for the facility with the application of the automatic fire sprinkler systems, 540,000 gallons will be necessary to dedicate to fire protection at the Proposed Facility (based on 3,000 gallons per minute for three hours). Taking into account an estimated average daily demand of 262,884 gallons, the Reservation's storage facilities of 1.1 million gallons will provide a 64% buffer for the fire protection water supply. The proposed water supply is therefore more than adequate for the Proposed Project (Andy Wells, 2008; Appendix J). Water in the Proposed Project's resort swimming pool will be available as a back up reservoir.

The casino, hotel, and parking structure will be provided with a complete fire suppression system served from the Reservation's water system. The fire suppression system will consist of both a standpipe system and a sprinkler system. Water pressure for the sprinkler system and fire hydrants will be provided by a diesel engine with a jockey pump. Two secondary water sources will be provided; one at ground level and one at the top of the hotel tower. The fire pump will be able to provide approximately 3,000 gallons per minute, based on a reasonable application of the State Fire Code. In compliance with California Fire Code Appendix III-BB, public fire hydrants will be spaced along Fire Department access roads at 300-foot intervals, and distances from hydrants to buildings will not exceed 400 feet from the most remote portions of the facility. In addition, all electrical rooms, computer rooms, surveillance rooms, and other areas that contain electrical equipment would be provided with a chemical fire suppression system, controlled locally and tied into the building fire alarm system.

As described in Section 3.13, the Tribe is planning the expansion of their existing fire station and anticipates that it will be able to respond to calls for fire protection. The expanded Fire Department will provide fire protection services with one Type I engine and four personnel, one Type III engine, a Paramedic Ambulance (ALS) with two personnel, and one Chief Officer. In

addition, the Tribe maintains mutual-aid agreements with the Pala, Rincon, and San Pasqual Fire Stations. Both the Pala Tribe and the Rincon Tribe have constructed or are constructing new fire stations and have the equipment and training to fight high-rise fires. Non-Indian fire protection agencies may also be called for assistance for major events through the mutual aid agreements the Tribe has in place.

As detailed in a recent Fire Analysis Report (Andy Wells, 2008; provided in Appendix J), development of the Pauma Fire Department together with implementation of Fire Service Agreements with the Pala, Rincon, San Pasqual, and Cal Fire Rincon CDF Fire Departments will result in the Proposed Project having considerable fire protection resources available upon its opening. Together, these resources will include 5 engines, 3 ladder trucks, 3 chief officers, and 34 highly-trained first response personnel. Response times will be less than two minutes for the Pauma Fire Department, seven minutes for Cal Fire Rincon CDF, nine minutes each for Pala and Rincon, and 15 minutes for San Pasqual.

The Proposed Project will not require the construction of new off-Reservation fire stations and will not substantially reduce the service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives of off-Reservation fire protection agencies. The Proposed Project will not overburden existing resources. In fact, the new Pauma station, equipment, and personnel, together with the new Agreements with Pala, San Pasqual, Rincon, CalFire, and the Yuima Municipal Water District, will be an asset to Pauma's neighbors.

The Proposed Project will continue to provide Emergency Medical Technicians 24 hours a day to respond to, evaluate, and intercede as necessary during medical emergencies. As indicated above, the Tribe will provide for a paramedic ambulance at its fire station, allowing ground transport and paramedics to arrive at the scene in less than 10 minutes, 90% of the time. This meets San Diego County's standard for medical response Policy/Procedure/Protocol No. P-801. In addition, the Pala and San Pasqual Fire Departments have agreed to respond to medical emergencies by providing a Type I Engine with Paramedic BLS Personnel for evaluation and treatment as needed to back up existing resources in the event of concurrent medical emergencies.

The Proposed Project has received "will serve" letters from Mercy Air Transport and Mercy Transport Services, Inc., indicating they are prepared to provide ALS transport in the event of a blocked road or a critical patient needing immediate specialized care (Appendix L).

Hospitals in the vicinity of the Proposed Project include the Palomar Community Hospital in Escondido and Fallbrook Community Hospital in Fallbrook. Both hospitals have provided "no impact" letters indicating that there will be no impact on their ability to provide adequate services with the increase in medical emergencies that the Proposed Project will bring (Appendix L).

Existing and planned emergency medical services will adequately respond to the expected increased call volume that will occur from the Proposed Project's higher occupant load. No

significant impacts on fire protection and life safety are expected to occur on the Reservation and in surrounding communities under the Proposed Project (Andy Wells, 2008; Appendix J).

### ***Police Protection?***

Law enforcement is currently provided on the Pauma Reservation by a security checkpoint, the casino's security force, and the San Diego County Sheriff's Department (Sheriff) operating out of the Valley Center/Pauma's Sheriff Substation (VCS). Although it does not provide services directly to the casino or the Reservation, the CHP also provides law enforcement services along SR-76 and I-15. The security checkpoint is located on Pauma Reservation Road, beyond the main casino entrance, and is for the security of the Tribe's residential and governmental facilities. Casino traffic does not go through the security checkpoint. The casino maintains a separate security staff to patrol the parking lot and the interior of the casino. Security staff are also stationed at each casino entrance.

It is expected that the new casino and hotel project will increase the demand for calls for service to the Sheriff. The Sheriff has expressed concerns about an increased drain on the VCS resources due to the operation of several casinos within the VCS, but has indicated that these effects will not be adverse with the provision of additional deputy resources at VCS, and with the Tribe's employment of a well-trained, on-site security staff.

### **(a) Tribe's Security Force**

The Tribe's security and surveillance force will consist of a total of 125 full-time persons to include a Security Director, Administrator to the Director, Fire Security Shift Managers, Security Shift Supervisors, and Security Officers. A surveillance force of CCTV operators who monitor both the gaming floor and the outside of the facility will balance the security force. Security and surveillance will be provided 24 hours per day, 7 days per week at the Proposed Project. The Tribe shall regularly evaluate its security situation to ensure that adequate security is employed and trained to meet law enforcement needs posed by the gaming facility.

### **(b) Compact Requirement To Negotiate MOU To Include Law Enforcement Services**

The Tribe's Compact at Section 10.8.8 requires it to "enter into an enforceable written agreement with the County with respect" to "compensation for law enforcement . . . and any other public services to be provided by the County" as a result of the Proposed Project. This Intergovernmental Agreement must be entered into before the commencement of the Proposed Project. Should the County and the Tribe not reach a negotiated agreement within 55 days of the issuance of the Final TEIR, the Compact requires Arbitration to establish the Tribe's performance of these mandatory measures. Whether these Compact-mandated measures are established by a negotiated Intergovernmental Agreement, or Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), or by an Arbitration Award, they are fully enforceable by the County against the Tribe. Thus, the Compact ensures that there will be no unmitigated impacts upon off-Reservation law enforcement or public safety from the Proposed Project.

**(c) Off-Reservation Impacts On Law Enforcement**

To evaluate the effect of the Proposed Project upon law enforcement resources at VCS, it is necessary to estimate the additional population to the VCS workload as a result of the Proposed Project. A reasonable estimate of the additional population added to the VCS workload as a result of the Proposed Project can be arrived at through the Traffic Report figures (see Appendix F). As set forth in section 3.1 of that report, the Pala Casino Resort, which is of similar size to the Proposed Project, generates 61.9 trips per 1000 square feet of gaming area.<sup>3</sup> The Proposed Project would increase the gaming area by 36,480 square feet. Thus, a reasonable estimate of daily trips to the Proposed Project is 2,258 ( $61.9 \times 36,480 = 2,258$ ). In addition, as set forth in that section, it is reasonable to assume that there will be 3 daily trips generated for each of the 400 hotel rooms, an additional 1,200 ADT. Thus, a reasonable estimate of ADTs generated by the Proposed Project is 3,458, or 1,729 round trips. According to the authors of the traffic report, there are an average of two persons per vehicle, for an average daily population of 3,458 people.

Pursuant to the Compact, the Tribe must pay for the law enforcement costs associated with this additional average daily population of 3,458 people attributable to the Proposed Project.<sup>4</sup> The precise amount of required funding (and determination of whether this need is best addressed through addition of a regular Patrol Deputy or Deputies, or Special Purpose Deputies, or some combination thereof) shall be addressed through the MOU process, described above. With this mitigation measure in place, the Proposed Project will not result in any significant impact upon off-Reservation law enforcement at VCS.

In addition to financing Deputy resources at VCS, the Tribe will further ensure that patrol services are in place through the California Highway Patrol (CHP) to address traffic flows associated with special events at the Project Site. The Tribe and CHP will enter into a Reimbursable Services Agreement to provide supplemental patrol, as needed, to ensure that there will be no effects on highway safety as a result of such special events (see Appendix L).

In summary, as required by the Compact, the Tribe shall enter into an MOU with the County or comply with an Arbitration Award, which shall include provisions for offsetting law enforcement impacts by providing compensation to the Sheriff. The Tribe will further ensure, through its Reimbursable Services Agreement with the CHP, that special events at the Proposed Project do not affect highway safety along SR-76 or I-15. Thus, there will be no significant impacts upon law enforcement as a result of the Proposed Project.

---

<sup>3</sup> For the purposes of examining traffic impacts, the Traffic Report has conservatively applied the formula of 100 average daily trips (ADTs) per 1,000 square feet of gaming space. For the purposes of law enforcement impacts, it is reasonable to use a formula of 61.9 ADTs per 1,000 square feet which, as the Traffic Report points out, is based upon empirical data from the similarly sized Pala Casino Resort and Spa. Were the 100 ADT formula used, the average daily population generated by the Proposed Project would come out to 4,848. The actual net average daily population added to the VCS service area, however, would have to account for reductions based on commuters leaving the VCS service area on a daily basis and employees and patrons already resident in that service area.

<sup>4</sup> The authors of the Traffic Report have confirmed that this figure accounts for employees as well as hotel and casino patrons.

### ***Schools?***

Students on the Pauma Reservation attend schools within the Valley Center Pauma Unified School District. The Proposed Project would not increase the demand for off-Reservation schooling as the increased employment opportunities are likely to be met by current residents of the Pauma Reservation and surrounding communities.

### ***Parks?***

There are no parks in the general vicinity of the Project Site. The closest park to the Project Site is Wilderness Gardens Open Space Preserve. It is unlikely that the Proposed Project would result in increased visitation to Wilderness Gardens Open Space Preserve due to the dissimilar nature of the two venues. There are no facilities at Wilderness Gardens Open Space Preserve.

### ***Other Public Facilities?***

There are no other public facilities on the project vicinity that would be adversely affected by the Proposed Project.

## **Mitigation Measures**

**Mitigation Measure PS-1:** The Tribe will mitigate impacts to the Sheriff's Valley Center Substation by increasing the number of security personnel when the new facility begins operation.

**Mitigation Measure PS-2:** The Tribe will address off-Reservation impacts to the County Sheriff's Department through the contribution of funding for personnel and equipment. The amount of the contribution is to be agreed upon by the Tribe and the County through the MOU process as defined by Section 10.8.8 and 10.8.9 of the Tribal/State Compact.

## **Expanded Casino Alternative**

Under the Expanded Casino Alternative, the need for increased fire protection and police protection would increase but would be less than the levels described for the Proposed Project. However, the increased need for fire protection may not warrant the Pauma Fire Department to expand, and mutual aid agreements with several other fire departments, may also not need to be entered. Like the Proposed Project, fire protection and emergency medical impacts for the Expanded Casino Alternative are below a level of significance. Mitigation measures PS-1 and PS-2 described for the Proposed Project would be implemented under the Expanded Casino Alternative, and thereby reduce police projection impacts below a level of significance. Like the Proposed Project, there is no impact to schools, parks, or other public facilities.

### **No Action Alternative**

The public services impacts described for the Proposed Project would not occur under the No Action Alternative.

### **4.14 Recreation**

*Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or would be accelerated?*

The Proposed Project would provide recreation, food, and entertainment for adult guests. It is not anticipated that many of the guests would also visit neighborhood or regional parks. In the event that they do combine a trip to the Proposed Project with a trip to a park, such as Palomar Mountain State Park or Wilderness Gardens Open Space Park, the presence of the project would not generate a sufficient number of park visitors to cause or accelerate the substantial physical deterioration of park facilities. A visit to a casino and hotel that provide on-site recreational amenities is a different experience from a visit to a park and is likely to appeal to a different segment of the general population. This impact would be less than significant.

*Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?*

The Proposed Project does include recreational facilities, including the casino, events center, spa, and pool area. These facilities are integrated into the Proposed Project and would not cause any adverse physical effects on the environment beyond those identified for the Proposed Project. This potential impact would be less than significant.

### **Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation measures are necessary for recreation.

### **Expanded Casino Alternative**

Under the Expanded Casino Alternative, recreational impacts would be the same or less than those described for the Proposed Project. There would not be a need for mitigation measures for recreation.

### **No Action Alternative**

The recreation impacts described for the Proposed Project would not occur under the No Action Alternative.

## 4.15 Socioeconomic Conditions and Environmental Justice

Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in long-term beneficial socioeconomic impacts to the Tribe. The project would be located on a portion of the Reservation designated for the Proposed Project in addition to an area of surrounding citrus groves. The Tribe has purchased several adjacent parcels containing citrus groves, so there would not be a net loss to the Tribe of land dedicated to agriculture. In addition, no homes would be directly impacted by the Proposed Project and a buffer would be maintained between the residential portion of the Reservation and the Proposed Project Site. The revenue that would be generated by the Proposed Project would allow the Tribe to improve healthcare, education, and housing opportunities on the Reservation. No adverse socioeconomic or environmental justice issues have been identified. This impact would be less than significant.

The potential for gambling addiction is possible with the development of any gambling operations, including Internet gambling, horse racetracks, bingo, card rooms, and the State's lottery. The growth of Indian casinos in the state has added to the number of potential venues for problem gamblers. There are now 61 Indian casinos in the State of California, with 10 in San Diego County. A State of California-commissioned study released in January 2007 concludes that there are as many as 1 million California adults who have developed "significant, lifetime problems related to gambling." This represents approximately 1 in 28 adults in the state, or approximately 3.6 percent of the adult population. The study was based on interviews with more than 7,000 California adults. The State of California has formed the Office of Problem Gambling, which spends over \$3 million a year collected from gaming tribes to address problem gambling through prevention. None of the funds are spent on treatment.

As detailed by the 2008 Rea & Parker Research study (Appendix I), the Proposed Project will not, in and of itself, create problem gambling. However, since the total on-site population of gamblers will increase under the Proposed Project, so too will there be an on-site increase of problem-gamblers. This increase in the number of on-site problem gamblers is expected to result from a shift of problem-gamblers who would otherwise be gambling at other Indian casinos in the area or other gambling outlets including those identified above.

The Proposed Project will not result in significant impacts associated with problem-gambling. However, the Pauma Tribe recognizes that additional individuals who have gambling problems will be attracted to the new facility, and as such will strive to identify and provide assistance to those individuals. The Tribe will therefore continue to provide the prevention efforts described in Section 3.15.

Additionally, there are several sources of help for problem gamblers in San Diego County that the Tribe will advocate: the California Council on Problem Gambling (Helpline: (800) 522-4700), San Diego Gamblers Anonymous (Hotline: (866) 239-2911), and the San Diego Center for Pathological Gambling. The California Council on Problem Gambling handled 3,515 calls to their gambling helpline from July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006. The majority of the calls were placed by gamblers, although calls were also received from spouses, children, parents, siblings, friends, employers, and therapists.



In 2006 the San Diego County Health and Human Services Agency provided the California Council on Problem Gambling a \$50,000 grant to train 80 counselors on how to identify, assess, and treat people addicted to gambling.

The existing casino provides information regarding gambling addiction and posts the State's gambling helpline number. Casino staff are also trained to detect problem gamblers. The Proposed Project would include continued training of casino staff and public awareness campaigns. The Proposed Project would also contribute to the State's problem gambling fund.

### **Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation measures are necessary for socioeconomic conditions or environmental justice.

### **Expanded Casino Alternative**

Under the Expanded Casino Alternative, socioeconomic benefits would increase for the Tribe. However, these benefits would not be as substantial as described for the Proposed Project, since the Expanded Casino Alternative would not include a hotel, retail space, spa and pool, multi-purpose events center, meeting space, or as many restaurants as for the Proposed Project. Without these resort facilities, the Expanded Casino Alternative would not be commensurate to the size and scope of the nearby casino resorts at Pala, Rincon, and Pechanga. The long-term beneficial socioeconomic benefits would not be as substantial for the Tribe under the Expanded Casino Alternative in comparison with those for the Proposed Project, and the Tribe would not be able to improve healthcare, education, and housing opportunities as extensively.

While the Expanded Casino Alternative will increase the number of individuals with problem gambling habits to the new facility, it will not in and of itself create problem gambling. Like the Proposed Project, the Tribe will continue to provide the prevention efforts described in Section 3.15 for the Proposed Project, and like the Proposed Project, the Expanded Casino Alternative would not result in significant impacts associated with problem-gambling.

### **No Action Alternative**

Under the No Action Alternative the Tribe would be left operating its current temporary facility, and would not be able to compete with other nearby tribal resorts at Pala, Rincon, and Pechanga. Beneficial socioeconomic represented by the Proposed Project would not occur, and the Tribe would not be able to improve healthcare, education, and housing opportunities.